Defendant's request for disclosure by the United States pursuant to

1

27

28

Motion is DENIED. There is no evidence before the Court of

08cr3282

Fed. R. Cr. P. 16(a)(1)(F) or (G). The only disclosure acknowledged by both the United States and Defendant is a series of correspondence, including a September 9, 2008 letter from Defendant's counsel to AUSA Stingley, which is directed to Fed. R. Cr. P. 16(a)(1)(A) and (E) and does not touch upon the subjects described in Fed. R. Cr. P. 16(a)(1)(F) or (G).

## 3. United States' Motion in Limine to Exclude Expert Testimony (Doc. # 31)

Motion is GRANTED in part and RESERVED in part. For the same reasons regarding #2 above, the Court DENIES the Motion. As to the second part of the Motion(opportunity pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 702, 703 and 705, to examine any permitted expert witness), the Court defers a ruling on that issue until Defendant's presentation, if any. If Defendant presents evidence and expert testimony is proffered, the United States may renew its Motion.

## 4. Defendant's Motion in Limine to Dismiss The Information or Require The Government to File a Bill of Particulars (Doc. # 29)

Motion is DENIED.

Defendant failed to timely file the Motion. Even if Defendant had timely filed the Motion, it would have been denied because the Information is sufficient. Further, the other disclosures made by the United States supplement the essential facts in

26 \\

//

27 \\

28 \\

08cr3282

## Case 3:08-cr-03282-LSP Document 35 Filed 01/21/09 PageID.198 Page 3 of 3

the Information and provide, in the aggregate, sufficient detail with which a defense to the charges may be prepared. DATED: January 21, 2009 Hon. Leo U.S. Magistrate Judge 

08cr3282